IN THE SPECIAL COURT OF REVIEW

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, No. 96

APPENDIX VOLUME II IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS OF THE HONORABLE SHARON KELLER

Charles L. Babcock
State Bar No. 01479500
1401 McKinney, Suite 1900
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 752-4200
(713) 752-4221 – Fax
Kurt Schwarz
State Bar No. 17871550
901 Main St., Ste. 6000
Dallas, Texas 75202
(214) 953-6000
(214) 953-5822 – Fax
ATTORNEYS FOR THE
HONORABLE SHARON KELLER

IN THE SPECIAL COURT OF REVIEW

Inquiry Concerning a Judge, No. 96

APPENDIX VOLUME II IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS OF THE HONORABLE SHARON KELLER

U. Excerpts from the Testimony of Judge Sharon Keller at the Hearing Held Before the Appointed Special Master on August 19, 2009

Exhibit U

1	INQUIRY CONCERNING JUDGE,						
2	NO. 96						
3	VOLUME 4 OF 7						
4							
5	IN RE: *						
6	*						
7	THE HONORABLE SHARON KELLER, *						
8	PRESIDING JUDGE OF THE TEXAS * HEARING HELD BEFORE						
9	COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS, * THE APPOINTED SPECIAL						
10	AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS * MASTER						
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17	On the 19th day of August, 2009, the following proceedings						
18	came on to be heard in the above-entitled and numbered cause						
19	before the Honorable David A. Berchelmann, Jr., Judge presiding,						
20	held in San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas:						
21							
22	Proceedings reported by computerized stenotype machine.						
23							
24							
25	COPY						

1	VOLUME 4								
2	HEARING BEFORE SPECIAL MASTER								
3	August 19, 20	09					Page	Vol.	
4	Examiner Rests						158	4	
5	Court Reporter's Certificate							4	
6	EXAMINER'S WITNESSES Direct				Cross	Voir Di	re	Vol.	
7	Hon. Sharon K	31 3,59					4		
8	Ed Marty (By	61,135	61,135 92,152				4		
9	ALPHABETICAL INDEX								
10			Direct		Cross	Voir Di	re	Vol.	
11	Hon. Sharon K		• = -		•			4	
12	Ed Marty (By	video)	61,135	92,152				4	
13	EXHIBIT INDEX								
14	Examiner's Ex. No.	ion	on Offered .		7 Junio La La J		T7 - 7		
15	32 V.T.C.A. Section 4			OLIE	:reu	Admitted		Vol.	
16			441.183	10		10		4	
17	33	to Dismi	Motion .ss 23			24		4	
18	Respondent's Ex. No.	Description		Offered		7		77.7	
19	EX. NO.					Admitted		Vol.	
20	47	TRAP 9.2		20		21		4	
21	48	Keller 000006 Gov't Code Sec.		29		31		4	
22	62	658.005 SCJC000114 Invoice, Bone		29		31		4	
23	Computer			2.0		21			
24	64	SHIRK 000081-83 DWQ of Bayou		29		31		4	
25	City Con DWQ of I		nternet			31		4	
		America,	INC.	29		31		4	
		America,	inc.	29		31		4	

1	THE COURT: Be seated, please.						
2	Okay, you may resume, Mr. McKetta.						
3	MR. McKETTA: Thank you, Your Honor.						
4	Your Honor, Judge Keller.						
5	HON. SHARON KELLER,						
6	having been previously duly sworn, testified further as follows:						
7	CROSS-EXAMINATION (CONT'D)						
8	BY MR. McKETTA:						
9	Q. May I ask you some questions about Ed Marty?						
10	A. Okay.						
11	Q. You perceived that he felt very loyal to you, did you						
12	not?						
13	A. I he was loyal to me.						
14	Q. Yes. And you are aware, are you not, that Ed Marty						
15	looked to you as his supervisor.						
16	A. I think he looked to the nine judges as his supervisors.						
17	Q. He certainly would report and comply with direction from						
18	any of the nine judges, they were all his bosses, were they not?						
19	A. Yes.						
20	Q. But aren't you aware that he perceived that you were his						
21	supervisor?						
22	A. I believe he perceived that Judge Price was his direct						
23	supervisor.						
24	Q. Are you aware that he perceived that you were the person						
25	to whom he had immediate reporting responsibilities?						
i							

- A. I'm not accusing you of mischaracterizing it.
- Q. On page 24 you remember you and I had a conversation and I asked, You have responsibilities, do you not, to follow the execution day procedures? And you said, To abide by them? And I said, Yes. And you answered, Yes. Is that right?
 - A. That's right.
- Q. And then I just asked to make clear that we were communicating right, And you personally had that responsibility, as do other members of the court; is that not so? And you agreed, Yes.
 - A. Okay.

- Q. Would you not agree that part of your duties of office included the responsibility to follow the court's execution day procedures?
 - A. My -- I'm sorry, would you repeat the question?
- Q. Don't you agree that part of your duties of office as a judge of the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals included, as with other judges, the responsibility to abide by the execution day procedures?
- A. No, I would say that my responsibility to the other judges required me to abide by the procedures.
- Q. How did you expect court personnel, including your general counsel, to abide by the execution day procedures in the years -- since you became presiding judge in 2001, how did you expect people to know how to comply with and know about them?

- 1 THE COURT: That's okay. Received in evidence.
- 2 | Okay, go ahead, Mr. Babcock.
- MR. BABCOCK: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 5 BY MR. BABCOCK:
- Q. Judge Keller, I want to ask you a little bit about your
- 7 | background.
- 8 A. Okay.
- 9 Q. Which we haven't gotten into yet. Can you tell the
- 10 | Court where you were born.
- 11 A. I was born in Dallas, Texas.
- 12 Q. Okay, you care to share the year?
- 13 A. 1953.
- Q. Younger than I, I'm certain. Were you raised in Dallas
- 15 | as well?
- 16 A. I was, I grew up in Dallas my whole life.
- 17 Q. All right. And where did you go to school?
- 18 A. I went to Greenhill.
- 19 Q. And I know from my daughters who went to ESD and beating
- 20 | Greenhill like a drum in every sport they played, that's a
- 21 | private prep school in Dallas; correct?
- 22 A. Yes. Yes, it is.
- 23 Q. And as I understand it you went there on scholarship?
- 24 A. Yes, most of the time.
- Q. And your parents' names?

1 A. I certainly do.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. You know that the Examiner, the special counsel amended those charges to add an additional canon approximately a month ago; correct?
 - A. Yes, I know that.
- Q. All right. One of the things that has been discussed in Mr. McKetta's questions of you is the issue of persistent. Do you have an understanding whether or not the charges against you are focused on this single day, September 25th of 2007, and specifically the one- to two-minute conversation that you had with Mr. Marty?
- A. Yes, that's my understanding.
 - Q. So I'm not going to talk about persistent anymore, I'll talk about the other thing, which is willful. The first charge is that you were guilty of a willful failure to comply with the law citing canon 2A. Let me ask you directly, do you believe that you have failed to comply with the law either willfully or unwillfully?
- 19 A. I do not.
- Q. What is the law that you are accused of failing to comply with so far as you understand?
- 22 A. I believe it's the execution day protocol.
- 23 Q. That was in effect on September 25th?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And that was not in writing?

- A. No, it was an oral tradition.
- Q. An oral tradition of the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

22

- Q. All right. Now, do you believe that this oral tradition that existed on September 25th of 2007 is a court rule, statute, constitutional provision or decisional law?
 - A. I do not.
- Q. Let me focus on the phrase court rule. Why is the oral tradition later reduced to writing? That the oral tradition of the court protocol on September 25th is not a court rule within the meaning of the canon that you're accused of violating?
- A. A court rule is something that is promulgated by a Supreme Court or the Court of Criminal Appeals, usually by the Supreme Court that is published for comment and reviewed and then adopted.
 - Q. All right.
 - A. It's -- it goes through a public process.
- 19 Q. All right. And is part of that public process the well
 20 run, well oiled machine of the Texas Supreme Court advisory
 21 committee?
 - A. That is a critical part of the process.
- Q. Thank you. And can you tell the Court whether the Court of Criminal Appeals has general rule making authority as the Supreme Court does?